

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/627,083	07/27/2000	Brig Barnum Elliott	00-4034	2480	
32127	7590 02/18/2005		EXAMINER		
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.			VANDERPUYE	VANDERPUYE, KENNETH N	
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN 600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MAILCODE HQEO3H14			2661		
IRVING, TX 75038		DATE MAILED: 02/18/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/627,083	ELLIOT				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kenneth N Vanderpuye	2661				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state of the state of the state of the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state of the	N. R.1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tild reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day it is do will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tatute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ T	his action is non-final.					
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)	drawn from consideration. wed. 1 <u>-37,40-43,46,47,59 and 60</u> is/are re 1 <u>4 and 45, 48</u> is/are objected to.	jected.				
Application Papers		,				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.	·				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applicat priority documents have been receiv reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summan Paper No(s)/Mail D					
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2661

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 12, 24, 36, 43, 37, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With regards to claims 12, 24, 36, 43, It is not clear what applicant means by the "location area comprises an RF propagation model."

With regards to claims 37, 42 it is not clear what applicant means by "derated radio receive range"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 6-7, 13, 18-19, 34-35, 40, 59-60 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed et al.(6,816,460).

Art Unit: 2661

With regards to claims 1, 13, 40, 59-60 Ahmed teaches in a communication system for communicating among a plurality of routers in a network(Fig. 1), the network having at least one <u>node</u> that can receive messages(Fig. 1@205), each of the communication routers including a transceiver to transmit and receive messages(nodes have retransmit capability), a method of operating a first router of the plurality of routers comprising the steps of:

Determining a location area corresponding to the <u>node</u>;(geometry-based routing protocol, see claim 1), formulating a message for the <u>node</u>,(inherently taught) determining a set of routers located within the location area(determining if the destination node is in a local area of nodes, col. 9 lines 39-40); and directing the message to the set of routers for retransmission to the <u>node(</u> col. 9 lines 41-48). What Ahmed fails to teach is the destination node being a radio silent node. Official notice is taken that a destination node can be a receiver or a transceiver depending on the need for one-way or two-way communication. Hence it would have been obvious as a matter of design choice.

Claims 3, 17, 41 are rejected because the location area comprises a radio reception area by the node.(Fig. <u>1@205</u>).

Art Unit: 2661

Claims 6-7, 18-19, 47 are rejected because in Fig. 1, a set of routers are within the location area of node 205.

Claims 34-35 are rejected because Ahmed teaches the method comprising the steps:

Determining an advertised position of the radio node; and calculating a location for the node based on the advertised position. (See claim 1, approximate location information). What Ahmed fails to teach is the destination node being a radio silent node. Official notice is taken that a destination node can be a receiver or a transceiver depending on the need for one-way or two-way communication. Hence it would have been obvious as a matter of design choice.

Claim 4, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed at al as applied to claims 1, 13 above, and further in view of Arnold (6,748,233).

With regards to claims 4, 15, Ahmed fails to teach the location area determined based on a planned trajectory. (col. 5 lines 16-24). It would have been obvious to combine Ahmed with Arnold for the purpose of determining the location of a node. Motivation being to track a node as it changes position.

Art Unit: 2661

Claim 8-9, 20-21, 25-27, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed at al as applied to claims 1, 13 above, and further in view of Lee at al.(6,728,777).

With regards to claims 8-9, 20-21, 27, 46, Ahmed fails to teaches the use of multicast routing and forwarding according to multicast routing trees. This is taught by Lee(col. 2 lines 38-48). It would have been obvious to combine Lee with Arnold for the purpose of delivering messages with multicast routing. The motivation being to selectively broadcast a message to a destination node.

Claim 25 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 8-9, 20-21, because the inventive concept is set in a multicast environment which Arnold does not teach. Arnold is set in a unicast environment. Lee teaches multicast routing with the aid of multicast trees. It would have been obvious to combine Lee with Arnold for the purpose of delivering messages with multicast routing. The motivation being to selectively broadcast a message to a destination node.

Claim 26 is rejected because Arnold teaches determining the location of the radio silent node(geometry-based routing protocol, see claim 1).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 32-33, 39, 49-58, 61 allowed.

Claims 2, 5, 10-11, 14, 16, 22-23, 28-31, 38, 44-45, 48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth N Vanderpuye whose telephone number is 571-272-3078. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(7:30-5:00) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-3126.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2661

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KNV 2/14/05 FRINETH VANDERPUYE PRIMARY EXAMINER